

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated September 1, 2006, claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-19 were presented for examination. Claims 1-2, and 4-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lindsay et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,105,020.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful and thorough review and action on the merits in this application.

### **I. Examiner's Interview**

On October 18, 2006, Applicant's Attorney, Examiner Cao and Examiner Wassum met for an Examiner's Interview at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Prior to the interview, Applicant's Attorney presented Examiners Cao and Wassum with a draft proposed amendment to the claims to be discussed during the interview. More specifically, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§101 and 102(b) were discussed. It was determined that the proposed amendment to claims 7 and 13 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). In addition, it was determined that with a further amendment to claim 1, the initial proposed amendment to the claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. More specifically, Examiner Wassum requested that Applicant further amend claim 1 to provide a tangible result, such as storing or displaying query result data, and that such an amendment is inherent in the disclosure provided. Accordingly, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to include language "displaying query results to a user."

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101**

In the Office Action dated September 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 4-12

under 35 U.S.C. §101 indicating the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, the Examiner has indicated that the language of claims 1-2 and 4-6 fail to recite a tangible results. Applicant has amended claim 1, as discussed in the interview of October 18, 2006, to claim a tangible result for optimization of the snow flake query. It was determined during the interview by Primary Examiner Wassum that the amendment to claim 1 does not add new subject matter to the application. Accordingly, based upon the amendment to claim 1 and the dependency of claims 2 and 4-6 on claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

In the Office Action dated September 1, 2006, the Examiner also rejected claims 7-12 and under 35 U.S. C. §101, indicating the claims are “system” claims that fail to recite hardware limitation. Applicant has amended claim 7 to positively claims a processor, storage media, and a database stored in the storage media. The amendment herein was discussed during the interview of October 18, 2006, and orally approved by Examiners Cao and Wassum. Accordingly, based upon the amendment to claim 7 and the dependency of claims 8-12 on claim 7, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 7-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

In the Office Action dated September 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 7-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lindsay et al.*

Applicant’s remarks pertaining to *Lindsay et al.* in response to the First Office Action are hereby incorporated by reference.

Applicant amended claim 1 in response to the First Office Action to include a limitation pertaining to pushing down the logical node, wherein the step of pushing down “includes each

dimension table rooted at the first generation child dimension table in the logical node.” In the Second Office Action dated September 1, 2006, the Examiner indicated that this amended language in claim 1 overcomes the rejection over *Lindsay et al.* under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicant has amended claims 7 and 13, in the manner proposed during the interview of October 18, 2006, to include this amended language. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 7-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate allowability of claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-19, and that the application pass to issue. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

For the reasons outlined above, withdrawal of the rejection of record and an allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rochelle Lieberman /  
Registration No. 39,276  
Attorney for Applicant

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC  
802 Still Creek Lane  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878  
Phone: (301) 948-7775  
Fax: (301) 948-7774  
Email: [rocky@legalplanner.com](mailto:rocky@legalplanner.com)

Date: October 24, 2006